

## **REMARKS**

The suggestion that “the Applicant concedes that “Abe’s beam splitter could be positioned near the output of Labaziewicz” is unfair. The exact language in the previous response was that “while the Examiner notes that Abe could be positioned near the output of the cited reference to Labaziewicz...” Clearly, there is no such admission. Likewise, there is no admission that Abe’s beam splitter accepts input light from one direction and outputs light in two different directions.

The suggestion that the limits argued in the remarks are not in the claims is respectfully traversed. The claim calls for a first optical system and a second optical system. Since the optical systems are separately made and called out, they cannot be the same optical system. Likewise, the claim calls for a first optical path and “a second optical path different from the first optical path.” Therefore, the paths cannot be of the same optical paths. The beam splitter is coupled to both optical paths to pass light from a selected optical path to the imaging array of said eyepiece. Thus, the beam splitter must receive light from two different optical paths and pass that light on to the eyepiece.

If the Examiner is right that Abe accepts light from one direction and outputs light in two different directions, it cannot possibly meet the claimed limitations.


While the discussion in the office action referred to “directions,” necessarily if light is on two different paths, it must come from two different directions. But the analysis is the same whether the word used is “paths” or “directions.” Abe does not receive light from two different paths and pass that light on a selected path to an imaging array. In other words, Abe does not receive light from one of two selected paths and pass that light on to the imaging array.

The assertion in the office action that Abe receives light from one direction and outputs light in two different directions (claimed to be admission by Applicant), does not meet the claimed limitation.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 21, 2005



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation